



TECOM Analysis of Logistics Training and Education Gaps

**23 Sep 2008
LtCol Wroten
TECOM G-3**



Agenda



- Purpose
- Background
- Supporting Organizations
- Logistics T&E Continuum
- CG, TECOM Guidance
- Identified T&E Gaps
- Results of Analysis
- Recommendation
- Way Ahead



Purpose



To gain Ground Logistics Board concurrence or modification to identified Logistics Training and Education gaps



Background



- CG, TECOM concerned that disparate T&E efforts lead to ineffective logistics integration within the MAGTF
- On 28 Jul 08, CG TECOM brought together TECOM, AD/C-I&L, MARFORCOM, and OPFOR (MLG) representatives to identify gaps in the Logistics Training and Education (T&E) Continuum
- TECOM conducted mission analysis to validate perceived gaps
- Results of primary Logistics T&E analysis consolidated for this brief




Supporting Commands



- A/DC I&L
 - LPC
 - LPV
- TECOM
 - G-3
 - GTB
 - SOML
 - MCCSS
 - MCTOG
 - MAGTFTC
- MARFORCOM
- DC CD&I
 - LID
- I MEF
 - CLR-15
- II MEF
 - CLR-27
- III MEF
 - CLR-37





Logistics T&E Continuum





THE PROBLEM







CG TECOM Guidance



- Frame the problem
 - Introduce the problem and what we are seeking - individual development by step in the hierarchy of logistics
 - What are the individual and collective requirements?
 - Examine in quantifiable and detailed ways IAW the SAT process.
 - What are we currently doing and where?
 - Consider all the training venues and PME Programs.
 - ***Then, what are the gaps and possible solutions?***
- Need Advocate and OPFORs to help identify requirements and chart Way Ahead using the MCPP model
- Develop an ESC to review outputs at defined steps in the process



Identified Logistics T&E Gaps



- LCE officers and SNCO are poorly trained in operational logistics decision making
- LCE officers understand the science of Command and Control, but are unable to effectively apply the art
- LCE staff officers and SNCO are not familiar with running and operating within the LCE COC at Co, Bn, Regt, and MLG levels



Identified Logistics T&E Gaps



- Inability to interface with other elements of the MAGTF and CE
- Insufficient training is provided to effectively operate in a Joint and interagency environment
- LCE officers and SNCO are unable to effectively employ Unit Training Management



Identified Logistics T&E Gaps



- Insufficient number of logistics topics are introduced to non-logistics officers in formal PME curriculum
- There are limited opportunities for logistics officers to receive logistics-focused resident and distance learning PME
- There is a lack of General Support supply operations instruction within the 30XX MOS curriculum
- LCE officers and SNCO are poorly trained in maintaining MAGTF readiness and execution of battlefield sustainment



Results of Analysis



- ✓ Regardless of identified gaps, individual MOS skill and operational proficiency is high within the LCE
- ✓ Preponderance of identified gaps refer to shortfalls in LSE Command and Control rather than MOS/collective proficiency



Results of Analysis



- ✓ Many of the identified training shortfalls apply to the entire MAGTF and not just LCE
 - ✓ COC Operations
 - ✓ UTM
- ✓ Some perceived training gaps solely a result of current operations
 - ✓ Manning shortfalls
 - ✓ Inability to conduct MOJT due to 1:1 dwell



Results of Analysis



- ✓ Logistics T&E Continuum segmented
 - ✓ Training Continuum and Education Continuum are not well-integrated
 - ✓ Multiple parallel LOCs to Logistics Advocacy
- ✓ Individual training shortfalls are evident in poor quality LCE collective/unit training
- ✓ Insufficient Core METL-based training



Results of Analysis



- ✓ Identifying collective training gaps within the LCE is not the same as within the GCE
 - ✓ LCE collective training applies to the command and control of dissimilar MOSs and functions
 - ✓ Lack of LCE C² training = lack of LCE collective training
- ✓ Logistics T&E curricula and methods (formal school vs. OJT) should be reviewed frequently by OPFOR SMEs and OCCFLD sponsors
 - ✓ Changes to LCE-related curricula is driven by OCCFLD sponsors and Advocate
 - ✓ OPFORs must engage sponsors, Advocate, and LOGTECOE when T&E gaps perceived



Recommendation



- Ground Logistics Board validates and approves Logistics T&E problem set and results of analysis
- Ground Logistics Board endorses continued LCE support to TECOM-led Logistics T&E Continuum improvement efforts



Way Ahead



- TECOM establishes an Executive Steering Committee in partnership with D/C I&L
- Operational Planning Team develops COAs and mitigation steps for Ground Logistics Board-approved T&E gaps
- Executive Steering Committee decides on and approves appropriate COAs
- TECOM devises the new Logistics T&E Continuum which could include MROC decisions



Questions?